DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 087 493 IR 000 257

AUTHOR Redmond, D. A.
TITLE One Library, One Community, How Many Services?
INSTITUTION Canadian Association of College and University Libraries, Ottawa (Ontario).
PUB DATE Jun 73
NOTE 29p.; Edited copy of a paper presented at the CACUL Workshop on Collection Development (Sackville, New Brunswick, Canada, June 16 and 17, 1973); See also IR 000 255 and IR 000 256

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Information Needs; Libraries; Library Planning; *Library Reference Services; *Library Services; *Management; Management Systems; University Libraries

ABSTRACT

The role of the library has traditionally been book or collection oriented. There is need for the university library to become service-oriented. Integrated collection management means the development and use of resources in the provision of services to meet the total information needs of the user community. Any resources which supply the required information should be utilized. Cooperative networks should be considered as a method of augmenting the information capacity of an individual library to meet the needs of users which are outside the traditional scope of the library's service. A university library should provide service to those formally associated with the institution and those citizens who are not connected with the university. Libraries typically lack integration of services. They are hindered by their organization and staffing patterns and a hospitable atmosphere are essential. Librarians also need to learn the politics of budgeting and participative integrated management to back up their services. (JG)

ED 087493

ONE LIBRARY, ONE COMMUNITY, HOW MANY SERVICES?

D. A. REDMOND

Edited from a paper read to the
CACUL WORKSHOP ON INTEGRATED COLLECTION
MANAGEMENT, SACKVILLE, N.B., JUNE 17, 1973

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

IR 000 257

INTEGRATED COLLECTION MANAGEMENT:
THE ROLE OF THE LIBRARY IN ITS COMMUNITY
CACUL WORKSHOP, JUNE 1973

ONE LIBRARY, ONE COMMUNITY
HOW MANY SERVICES?

D. A. REDMOND

An American, Richard Eggleton, writing of the British scene in the Library Association Record, says:

> There seems to be great discontent...and a fundamental philosophical difference among librarians about the role of the library in an ever-changing society. This philosophical difference appears to be, as in America, based primarily upon the age of the individuals involved. It is, in fact, a 'generation gap' of insoluble proportions. Because of the nature of the differences between generations...nothing short of the changing of the guard will bring peace... This peace will last only until another such crisis develops over the role of the library in society.*

* Lib. Assn. Rec. 75 no. 3 p.66 (March 1973)

Taken in Eggleton's terms, the problem of the role of the university library in its community may be insoluble. The problem of the library's role is related to the whole problem of the composition and role in society of the academic community.

William Ramirez, reviewing Paul Wasserman's The New Librarianship, calls the public library "an incomprehensively conventional, passive, and complacent institution in spite

of constant reminders that fully two-thirds of our nation's people are virtually untouched by it."* I wonder whether we

*Lib. J. 98 no. 8 p. 1257 (April 15,1973)

university librarians can avoid wincing a little at that, or can afford to call any kettles black. Janice Ladendorf says, "Most people regard libraries as alien and forbidding places, mere storehouses from which books can be borrowed." Harold Ettelt comments that

> Besides academic libraries, about the only places I know of where dignity is stressed are doctor's offices, churches, and cemeteries. None of these are places in which people spend much time.... There we sit, in front of the works of Mark Twain, Bernard Shaw, and Dick Gregory, attempting to get patrons to love the place; the while putting them under the necessity of being dignified and trying to be so ourselves. Sometimes I think even the books are winking at us.*

* Lib. J. 98 no. 9 p.1412 (May 1,1973)

University libraries, under the pressing and vocal guidance of faculty members, have always been book-directed---collection-oriented. The faculty member, to make a gross generalization, wants the books he wants when he wants them. If the university library has major problems, this is the biggest one, and the hardest to optimize. I do not expect to find a solution and proclaim it in this brief study today.

That is why I'll propose a narrower title for this talk: One Library, One Community, How Many Services?

Dean Tudor says in Special Libraries for last November, "The objective is not to fill a library with books but to see that information gets into the hands of those who need it." Michael Sinclair, of Queen's, who puts everything in economic terms, says the objective of any library is to maximize the return on the users' expenditures on information. Setting

objectives for a library is difficult; and setting a system of objectives for a university library, within the highly complex and unrationalized system that is a university, is doubly difficult---or perhaps only a rhetorical exercise. Let us then be pragmatic and empirical, and simply ignore the setting of objectives for a while.

Money is the basic problem. If we had no money problems, we'd have few other insoluble problems---or at least no need to optimize among them. Lacking money, in a climate of static or receding budget support, the worst of which we may yet have to see, the set of problems, those which give rise to the topic of this workshop, integrated collection management, must be juggled simultaneously.

The title of a recent book by Hickey, Problems in Organizing Library Collections, suggests that it might be relevant. The review of Hickey's book in the Spring issue of RQ says:

> The book should be subtitled "Problems in running a technical services department" with emphasis on the human factor. Underlining all the case studies is the problem of management...*

* RQ 12 no.3 p.316 (Spring 1973)

Integrated collection management, then, should mean just that: a management problem, in which collections and services are integrated---that is, brought together into one, over some wide base.

I shall direct myself to the need for the university library to be service-oriented. This is not to say it must not be collection-oriented, but that the objective of a library, as a service agency, is to supply the information needs of users. Services which are appropriate to their needs---not necessarily traditional library services---must be supported by appropriate collections.

Libraries are not the only agencies with this problem of being insufficiently service-oriented. The medical profession has had a poor image, for being disease-centered rather than patient-centered. ("That broken leg in Room 221B is complaining again."). The result has been, in Ontario, a government stress on the development of 'health care units' close to the community, and the rise of 'family practice units'--- the delivery of health care, and thought for the patient. University libraries may well find that schemes for their co-ordinated development will be adopted and funded by government, in order to direct them similarly to services rather than resources. This will certainly happen if they do not self-direct toward cooperative and comprehensive services.

Here's a definition:

> Integrated collection management means the development and use of resources in the provision of services designed, possibly by user and librarian working together, to meet the total information needs of the user community in both the local and wider senses.

This definition really begs some others. What are resources? What are total information needs? What is the user community? And then the services, and whether librarian and user must work together, will cause argument.

Resources must be taken in the widest sense. Not long ago I asked one of our information services staff to get me the name of the chairman of a local service club. When she came up with it I asked, just out of curiosity, where did you find his name? From Information Kingston, was the reply. Information Kingston is the local storefront center, supported by an L.I.P. grant. That's cheating! I said, but I didn't really believe it.

Rule Number One must be: Take resources where they come, in what form they can be found. Resources are everything that supplies information. Let's not make a hard formal definition of "collection" or of collection management. The invisible

college still does more research than all the rest. Resources may be the books on your shelves, or those on other shelves elsewhere---or the knowledge in people's heads.

This is a reason why we have so many "learning resource centers", "data centers", "media centers" and what have you. As the old Scots said, "New presbyter is but old priest writ large." "Library" has a limited connotation to many people. A library is where you get books, not information. An "information analysis center" sounds impressive, but it does nothing which libraries could not do if they tried; and things libraries should be doing if they set about it.

Ed Strable, outgoing president of SLA, says, "Just watch the hackles rise as the information center is described as 'innovative', 'non-standard', 'dynamic', 'outreaching' and 'modern', as it is compared to the 'archival', 'traditional', 'standard', 'limited', and 'record-centered' special library."*

* Spec. Libs. 63 no.11 p.7A (Nov.1972)

Total information needs is a phrase which could get me in trouble. The library need not be, like St. Paul, all things to all men. There will be limits placed, by whatever mechanism of rationalization (that's a dirty word, you know), on the areas which will be covered, or at least on the level of intensity or depth to which any topic will be covered in the resources of a given library.

We shall have a matrix of disciplines or of specific areas of interest, and of materials and levels of intensity within them. We shall not refuse to handle requests for services or resources outside this matrix---we shall set in motion some network of supplementary services and resources. The user will have to be prepared for the cost, in time and money, of his needs beyond the agreed limits of the matrix.

In order for such a scheme to succeed, several ideas must be simultaneously put in motion and sold to the customers. The idea that not all needed resources will be here, now, is not new---it is simply a change in the users' definition

of what resources are essential here and now. The effective system of supplementary resources and services will be difficult to achieve. For many institutions, cooperation costs something---unrequited love maybe, or hard cash from a limited budget. This must be reimbursed by an agreed and effective mechanism. But be prepared to pay, we must.

No one should suffer, because of cooperation, unless he is a real library masochist. Institutions don't suffer---they creak. If there is no financial oil, the bearings seize and the wheels stop turning. The user must be assured that a network exists and operates effectively, to meet his needs, before he will agree to limitation of local resources. I shall say something more about cost to the user in a moment.

The minor cause célèbre in California is an example. As reported in American Libraries and Library Journal.

> "Librarians at California's two systems of higher education are combining effort to block a proposal that they consolidate research facilities.
>
> "The proposal was developed after an audit conducted by the office of State Finance Director Verne Orr..."

The proposal was that there be "two regional intersegumental consortia for library cooperation" with headquarters at Berkeley and UCLA, each of which

> "would continue to maintain huge research libraries, but each of the other twenty-five libraries would purchase low-use material only in the areas in which it is specializing (if any). Specialties would be arranged by subject area, so that the total range of subjects receives coverage, but not duplication, within each region."*
>
> "The document stated that the first priority of all university libraries should be the acquisition and maintenance of services supporting authorized undergraduate and graduate instructional programs, but it then narrowed its focus, recommending differing roles for the two research libraries...and the campus

---

* Amer.Libs. 4 no.3 p.129-30 (March 1973

libraries like Irvine's. Giving top priority to the two research facilities"

---and that is not what the story said in the immediately preceding sentence!---

"the report recommended that university-wide library resources be maintained in these facilities, and it said that each of the libraries should maintain a growth rate of four percent of their collections...

"Rate as a third resource allocation priority: improved access and exchange of library material among the UC libraries."*

* Lib.J. 98 no. 7 p. 1070 (April 1, 1973)

Page Ackerman says in American Libraries for May that the plan "divorces the development of library collections from the development of the campus academic programs."*

* Amer. Libs. 4 no. 5 p.282 (May 1973)

At this distance and secondhand through the press, I trust the details no more than I credited LJ's reporting of the Robarts Library hassle at the University of Toronto last year, but I would guess that faculty made the loudest outcries. These seem eminently reasonable and massive suggested priorities, much as we lack details. Yet the report was rejected out of hand by the Academic Senate of the University of California at Irvine, for one, and by librarians and president's offices in the California system. The points that may be made are, first, that names could be changed---read "Ontario" for "California"; and it can easily be seen that it's version of that popular Upper Canadian game called "Let's All Hate Toronto".

Secondly, integrated systems, being massive changes, must be carefully considered, with ample psychological as well as technical preparation. Acceptability to the academic system---will the faculty buy it?---is the primary touchstone.

This may well vary from one university to another, but the model is still true. An integrated, network-based library system will probably give better service, and is probably inevitable---but it must be expected, understood, wanted, and lived with. Universities are institutions with massively quixotic independence and resistance to change. Will they accede to a library network, however imposed?

The second item in the definition which I proposed is the user community. Who are they? To what privileges are they entitled? These questions are akin to those of the lawyer in St. Luke's Gospel, who asked "Who is my neighbor?" Perhaps the parable of the Good Samaritan, which is the answer he got, is not basically at odds with the message in that modern-day parable of Archie Bunker, who finds it "All in the Family". It's the argument, not the answer, that distracts us. Peck, in Special Libraries for December, says, "Each type of library uses the word 'community' to depict some particular mass grouping of society which generates varying degrees of demand for information service by libraries."*

* Spec. Libs. 63 no. 12 p.550 (Dec.1972)

A university library has a primary and a secondary community. The primary community consists of those who are formally part of the educational institution: faculty, staff and students. The agreed resource matrix must be designed for their needs. The secondary community is defined, if at all, in the way the parable defined "neighbor". In Ontario, the Commission on Post-Secondary Education has given us a reasonably simple definition in its Recommendation 25:

> Citizens of Ontario should, subject to reasonable rules and regulations, have access to all libraries, including those in universities, colleges of applied arts and technology, and secondary schools.*

* Ont.Comm. on Post-Sec.Educ. The learning society. Tor., Min.of Govt. Services, 1972. p.55

James B. Dodd, in a paper presented at the Special Libraries Association conference in Pittsburgh described a

"Pay-As-You-Go Plan for Satellite Industrial Libraries Using Academic Facilities". The idea of an academic library providing industrial service is not new, but the idea of open-ended service, in which the academic library supplies service to many comers as a matter of course, is. Dodd says:

> Who are our off-campus users? ... We serve our communities ... The first sense of community ... is the geo-political one in which we are located and to which we owe our existence because it is the major source of ... funding ... The second community which we endeavor to serve is that of science, technology and management, and there are no boundaries on that community ... Cross-country access to this library is as convenient as cross-town and almost as convenient as cross-campus ... We are not and do not intend to be in competition with any public library. We want our service to be a supplement to the services that anyone can get from their own public library.*

---

* From advance private copy; abstract in Spec. Libs. 64 no.2 p.107 (Feb.1973)

John Colson discusses the complexity of the society in which libraries operate, in the Spring issue of RQ:

> ... The university is composed of and involved with a wide range of communities; from departmental faculties to graduate student councils to undergraduate social groups; from federal research and executive agencies...down to...local volunteer fire departments...and negotiating groups of local businessmen who want their university to stop doing one thing and start doing another.*

---

* RQ 12 no. 3 p.269 (Spring 1973)

However the picture may be spread out, the secondary or external community is important to the university library, which must recognize not only its needs, but as Colson goes on to point out, the potential resources especially of archives which it can give to the library.

Now, "reasonable rules and regulations" for external users, in the words of the Commission on Post-Secondary Education, can go all the way from a fifty-dollar fee for services, to in-library reading privileges only. Whether

it implies a risk of inundation under what a late and respected university librarian once called "smelly brats" I doubt. Whether it implies inundation of any kind, I doubt. It would be instructive to calculate how many serious users of a research library would be generated in the community surrounding a university library. McMaster University, in a much larger urban community than Queen's, has issued about a thousand courtesy borrower's cards---about the same number as Queen's. And most of the Queen's community resident borrowers are University dependents.

Recently I tried to work out the relative demand for seats in the Metropolitan Toronto Central Library, the public research library in Canada which most resembles a university library,* and which is not yet swamped (not completely) with would-be users.

---

* An ironic footnote: The situation in New York City is almost exactly reversed; where the New York Public Library is the monumental second support for university libraries inadequate locally and even nationally. The difference in scale of course makes the analogy inapplicable to Canada. Cf. "The Library murder case," by Ellen Moers, N.Y.Review of Books no.7 p.31-35 (May 3, 1973), reviewing Phyllis Dain's The New York Public Library (N.Y.P.L.,1973)

The pencil figuring was not conclusive, but I strongly suspect that the university library which has adequate facilities for its primary community will not be swamped by the demand from any secondary community. Fear of a shortage of supply (inadequate resources) or of facilities (inadequate reader and staff space) may be unfounded, without careful study of existing use patterns. How much does each library staff know about the ways and extent to which its library is actually used? And whether it is actually, as the old Happy Gang song used to have it, a case of "The room is full and won't hold any more."

The basic "filtering" precaution is of course the "reasonable regulation" that the secondary user should exhaust public and other library resources first. The text of the report on Post-Secondary Education makes this clear:

> "By access we mean that any citizen of Ontario has the right to ask for and receive the services of any publicly supported library, if he can demonstrate a particular need and if this need cannot be met by a library of primary direct public access. ... A client cannot function in his own distinctive learning process unless a special library offers him resources that he cannot otherwise obtain."*

* Ibid. p.47

Dodd, speaking of Georgia Institute of Technology, says: "Service to the public for a faculty member is not all public relations intended to keep the level of public support high. ... All the research work and all the professional reading that one can find time for will not do the job unless there is a continual dialogue with the "real world" outside the classroom and laboratory. This process of staying professionally alive is just as important to the library on campus as it is to the teaching faculty. (Emphasis mine---DAR) On our campus, the library is considered a research facility and as such is available to off-campus use on much the same basis as are other research tools... such as the nuclear research reactor... Here is the single most significant aspect of service to business and industry from any academic library. No longer was such service something to be handed out under the table begrudgingly and worked on whenever there was time for it, or provided at the cost of some other service that could be given to faculty and students."

The definition which I suggested stresses the provision of services, and I said the university library must be service-oriented. Traditional reader services can be roughly categorized as:

Form-limited: for example, periodicals, archives rare books, audiovisual materials, microforms

Use-limited: such as reserve books, browsing, reference, undergraduate, even faculty reading rooms

Purpose-limited: student orientation, reference (again), circulation

Are you surprised to have circulation listed as "purpose-limited"? But it is. The traditional circulation service confines itself to fetching from the stack, or accepting what the user finds in the open stack, and keeping records of volumes which users take home---and which are not in any of the form- or use-limited services. This can be endlessly confusing to the user, especially if the reference desk or the special-service desk is closed at certain hours. Either the circulation service must enlarge its capability, or the user's frustration will grow. *

This list includes no unlimited, one-stop-shopping services.

Lee Regan, also in the Spring issue of RQ, is talking about reader's advisory service, something which many university librarians may consider a slightly quaint public library service, but he recalls the words of John Chancellor---not the television John Chancellor unless he said this when he was seven years old:

> Let us set about to remedy this something that makes the public feel uneasy and hurried in a library, let us arrange that there shall be at least one corner and one individual in each library to whom a person can go and tell perhaps a long tale to describe a vague need or desire, without feeling that he is interfering with the librarian and the running of the business. **

---

* In the May-June 1973 Canadian Library Journal, North describes "resource islands" in the Mount Royal College library as a "one-stop-shopping" service. I am pleased that we quite independently hit on the same phrase and concept, and that such an example of the service can be shown. I had not seen the article at the time of writing and delivery of this paper at the CLA Conference in June 1973

** ALA Bull. 25 no. 4 p. 137 (April 1931) quoted in RQ 12 no. 3 p.228 (Spring 1973)

Look at the traditional reference department. I do not intend to flog the reference horse out of any spite or animosity, in general or in particular. I would guess that most reference librarians consider it entirely reasonable that they will not listen sympathetically to the bewildered student and guide him by the hand through all the intricacies of collecting the material he needs. They'll refer him, at some point, to other services or departments, and/or push him off on his own. They'll offer service so far, then leave him. They'll say it's part of the learning process. Learning what? They will not listen sympathetically to the intricate problems of a faculty member, take the whole problem off his hands and eventually produce a finished information package for him. Why won't they? The special librarian will, and I would guess that the ratio of special librarians to their users is not dramatically lower than the ratio of professional staff in a university library to the total faculty. University libraries have much to learn from special libraries, where the motto is "Putting knowledge to work" and service is the reason for being.

There is no single person to whom an individual member of the academic community---except probably the president---can turn, and relate (there's that overdone word) for his information needs. I believe one of the major reasons, at least, why such studies as Task Force ABLE,* conducted by the National Agricultural Library in 1965, could show the low ranking of traditional library services among sources of information used by its respondents---and there are many such studies---is that there is inadequate wide-spectrum one-stop one-person service available.

---

* U.S. National Agricultural Library. Report of Task Force ABLE, Agricultural Biological Literature Exploitation, a systems study of the National Agricultural Library and its users. March 1965. 477p.

The possible range of academic library services goes from the negligible, through the traditional, to the "library-college" in which faculty and librarians become indistinguishable, the

learning process is carried on in the library, and Louis Shores is vindicated. It has been claimed there is no true 100% library-college operating. I shall not try to guess. In the one situation where this should be entirely feasible, however, in the library schools, we do not really see it. Is the library school library a paradox, and an undesirable one?

Disregarding the extremes, what change of service patterns can be seen? The subject-divisional library avoids the form-limited, use-limited and purpose-limited breakdowns, but introduces a new one. In the subject-divided library, the user whose interests range across disciplines---and there are many such in the university---trips frequently over those little invisible fences between divisions. In a research library which shall be nameless, but which has a noted stackful of books and a grist of subject divisions, I not long ago had three of these divisions all disclaim any responsibility for tracking down a book which I wanted from the main stack. This is not any optimal improvement in service. And when it comes to mechanically complex forms of resources---microforms or audiovisual materials---not infrequently the subject-divisional plan falls back on the form-limited plan.

An example of an unlimited service is very difficult to find. At Queen's we have introduced an experimental Bibliographic Research Service, which offers the services of a senior bibliographer for an extended time, if need be a couple of weeks, for projects which cannot behandled by the regular Information Services staff---the regular reference desk service. This bibliographer would work closely with the user, discuss his project and problems, and tap all the resources of the library system. However, when you consider who can best use such a service, it too becomes user-limited. It can handle perhaps a score of users per month at the outside, and is limited to users with serious and extensive projects. It does not help the beginning user, the bewildered student, or the man in the street who needs a backup for the public library.

Another idea has been that of designating a single library staff member as liaison person for a particular teaching department. This is still not the same as every-user one-stop service. The use of bibliographic assistants for faculty members, reported in Library-College Journal---which has now done a cop-out by renaming itself Learning Today---somewhat resembles our Bibliographic Research Service, but does not provide every-user service. The literature reports that the bibliographic assistants tended to sink into cheap library labor for the lucky faculty member, rather at the level of graduate student research assistants, instead of professional bibliographic assistance.

Should all kinds of service be provided from one library facility, serving all levels of users both primary and secondary? Examples could be cited such as the new Boston Public Library complex of which I've heard enthusiastic report. It could be asked, What's so new? Aren't university libraries, and major public libraries, now giving all kinds of services under one roof? This is not the point. My own library has been characterized as very difficult to use (if you're a dissatisfied user) even under one roof --- for reasons of lack of integration---lack of a system-planned approach to services. We're working on that problem, but it takes money to renovate an existing building. To provide simultaneously several levels of service---research, undergraduate, and what academic librarians sometimes refer to, just not-quite-contemptuously, as "public library stuff", even in a support role---is quite a team of horses to ride three abreast and bareback---but not that much harder than riding two, which we already try to do. Dodd adds this warning:

> The academic library gets itself in jeopardy when it gives or makes available better service to off-campus people than it does to its own faculty and students. ... The sturdier posture of service to off-campus users has been a factor in developing service to on-campus users.

In proposing some kind of approach---I shall not call it a solution---these necessary criteria could be set out:

1. Library organization: A responsive, flexible, organization and management structure, sensitive to the needs of the

users, distinguishing situation from opinion and pressure, making the best use of staff ability and resources through participative management. If that's too much of a pat phrase, explore modern theories of organizational management.

2. An approach to adequate institutional funding support. Here is the real job---selling the value of the library system to those who supply the money. Within the limits of the money which can be supplied, the purse-holders must be convinced of the library's objectives, and of its ability to use the dough.

3. Collections developed for the library's primary community, at levels, and in areas, rationally delineated to match the university's activity.

The corollary to this is that if additional resources are needed for service to the secondary community, outside funding should be supplied when the requirement is imposed that service be provided. The outstanding examples are the New York State regional schemes, the 3-R's and NYSILL.

4. Services designed to maximize usefulness of resources to the individual users in the primary community.

Marshall Field put it in that almost oldest of all merchandising adages, "Give The Lady What She Wants". I haven't been able to bring in the famous Canadian slogan, "Goods Satisfactory or Money Refunded", but we do have to remember that user satisfaction is a prime objective.

At the same time I repeat the disclaimer: The library need not necessarily meet all the demands of its primary users. Go back to point 3 above: collections and services, both rationally delineated to match the university's activity. This should not be construed to conflict with an idea of "total information needs of the user community". Optimization will be necessary.

To give a very minor example: Our major record collections at Queen's are in our Music Library, which supports primarily the Bachelor of Music program and students taking non-major music courses; and in the Education Library as part of its Resource Center. Occasionally I wish we could develop a record collection in the main library, for noncurricular student use. Should we wait until there is outcry and demand?

I reluctantly decide we will chance it, and do without a third unit, even if this is less than optimal for all users.

We do not know enough about the psychology of interrupted supply. A person seeking information tends to use the easiest path. The invisible college is the easiest; the library is less easy. He may use a difficult path if the payoff in speed is sufficient. He may not like it, and we know very little about the difficulty he will bear with to get a certain payoff. We know very little about the real cash value of the user's time, and the time he is prepared to wait (his cost) for information service---as distinguished, please note, from the things he says about how fast he needs it, when he asks for an interlibrary loan. Experience has shown that despite professions of haste, the user may not be in a hurry to pick up an interlibrary loan when it arrives. Some investigation would be useful, into the decay in urgency of need with time.

How many of our failures to provide library service are based on the principle of "ignore the users and they'll go away"?

There was much talk about Planning-Programming-Budgeting Systems in previous CACUL workshops. There has been some argument whether PPBS is viable in a university. Dean Tudor, who appropriately is the librarian in the Ontario Treasury, has the simplest---maybe the only understandable---article about PPBS, in Special Libraries for November 1972.*

* Spec. Libs. 63 no.11 p.517-527 (Nov.1972)

The steps seem simple enough:

1. Analyze clearly and state objectives.
2. List objectives in order of priority and attach dollar costs to them.
3. Select among objectives.

The difficulties are to state library objectives within the university; to quantify and cost them; to measure output of a library system. Is the benefit of a library measurable---

any more than the benefit of a fountain in the park? Yet this hard costing must be done. Surrogates, or quantifiable measures of the unquantifiable, must be found. Worst come to worst, this may mean deliberately reducing the amount of grease on the wheel until the wheel squeaks---rather than waiting for the wheel to squeak of itself. At such a point, however, it can be told how much grease is needed.

Collection and services, to repeat endlessly, are interdependent. Budgeting in a library is not an either/or situation---either books or services---for that reason. There is in addition what the electrical engineer would call hysteresis, in the provision of library services: that is, increased services lead only slowly to increased appreciation by users. When services decrease, however, a different psychological path is followed, and user opinion can change very rapidly. There is a vicious cycle created by inadequate services, which beget certain user attitudes and a poor expectation of the library. This in turn could lead to lower support, or refusal to increase support, and consequently still poorer service. To forestall this, the library must have clear plans and priorities. There may be situations in which no money can possibly be forthcoming, and the librarian, as McAnally and Downs have indicated*

* Coll.Res.Libs. 34 no.2 p.103-125 (March 1973)

is caught between the upper millstone of academic opinion and the nether millstone of finance. Budget becomes a policy in a day of financial stringency. The university librarian must learn the politics of budgeting. These politics may include the threat of charges for services rendered within the institution---not solely to another institution. How many computing centers give free services beyond a certain basic level?

Dodd, in describing the off-campus services and charges of the Georgia Tech library, says "The concept of the university library as an on-campus research tool provides one precedent for the fee basis for service rendered."

Dodd's paper suggests, in the words of the abstract, that "A flexible organization, trend-setting methods, strong collections, and a mandate to serve make remote access to this academic library/data bank practical." They also make strong on-campus services possible; but the concept suggests that price tags might apply for at-home users as well.

Lack of adequate staff looms large in the path of developing new patterns of service. How can a small staff cope simultaneously with the technical problems of acquiring and organizing a collection, with assisting growing crowds of new users at the undergraduate level, and yet at the same time interrelate the development of the collection with sophisticated one-point ask-me-anything-and-I'll-tell-you-no-lies services to all levels of users---and with outside users added as straws to the camel's back?

Maybe it can't be done. In planning a reorganized library administrative structure at Queen's, we quickly agreed that for adequate collection-development-cum-bibliographic-service, a staff of nine to twelve professionals was needed. Our six information services staff could hardly cope with a full-scale collection-development program on top of their normal load of undergraduate desk service, interlibrary loan, and student orientation. The bibliographic research service which I have mentioned tapped new demands, rather than siphoning off more than a few difficult requests, and the load is still such that we have barely scraped at the hide of the collection development elephant.

Nevertheless, a major barrier to the implementation of this concept of "integrated collection management"---or what I should like to call integrated information management---is our existing services and organizational patterns. Heenan in RQ asks, "Why not make reference less of a place and more of a service?"* Someone in our preparatory sessions said,

* RQ 10 no.3 p.217 (Spring 1971)

"one of the biggest pitfalls is seeing public service in terms of the reference room. When you get students and faculty

walking into the technical services areas you make them realize that all these are parts of the library service."

Suppose we were to reduce the library to its basic elements: informational materials, organized by some scheme; a catalog, and a master serials record; a librarian to ac quire and to organize and to assist the user. In the one-man library, one-stop service is possible. Our troubles start when we get bigger. Assistants don't help us---they get in the way. You, as well as I, know more than one librarian who'd rather do it all alone, than have to train, supervise and agonize over assistants. It's our professional failing.

We have inherited our staffing patterns, like as not, and inherited the services in our libraries, just as much as we as individuals inherited the color of our eyes. We have even inherited terminology that turns people off. Why do we call it "reference service"? Both Queen's and the Kingston Public Library changed that term to "Information Services".

If these few things are the basics, and if one person can provide the service, why does size play such a negative role? It should make possible many new, exciting services. Surely file length cannot be the sole problem. I shall not malign catalogers for complicated systems. I shall not blame the order staff or the book trade for slow response. We can even learn to live with backlogs, if they can be converted to what the irrepressible Daniel Gore calls "Fastcat"* and someone else a "frontlog". Blame-placing is fruitless. We have a snarl of Gordian spaghetti, or barbed wire, which must be cut.

---

* Lib.J. 97 p.2693-5 (Sep.1,1972)

We must place ourselves in the user's shoes. We scare off potential users with complicated systems, impersonal buildings, and forbidding regulations. Atmosphere, a congenial environment, and approachability are needed in both library facilities and library services. An atmosphere which someone in our group described as a "wide open welcome"---not necessarily a concentration of ser vices around the front lobby---

should greet the user entering the library. We have much to learn from marketing research. Recently we were discussing a short course in management, being offered by our business school, which a number of our staff attended. Someone said, "The marketing session won't be of much interest." On the contrary, it should be of a great deal of interest. Janice Ladendorf says in RQ that libraries

> "share many characteristics with any retail organization which has to sell its products. People may be forced to go to doctors or lawyers, but they usually have to be persuaded to use libraries. Overlooking these facts has inhibited librarians from applying market analysis or salesmanship to their customer relation problems."*

* RQ 11 no. 4 p.337 (Summer 1972)

There is no basic difference in user psychology between an academic and a public library. Some, the faculty, are more aggressive; but the proportion of avid users is probably no higher than the seven percent cited by Ladendorf---while 45% of students probably are "hard core non-readers".

Users must be encouraged. If they are lonely, depressed, repelled, confused, or overwhelmed, they will reject library services. A plaintive question appeared in a fat report issued recently from the library school at Western Ontario:

> Why are libraries approached only reluctantly? Is it because the libraries are not good, or because there is something in human nature that prefers not to use libraries?*

* University of Western Ontario. School of Library and Information Science.
Medical information network for Ontario; determination of need.
London, 1973. p.62-63

I think it's even simpler---salesmanship and friendliness. Some users may not even want service---they may just want to air their problems. Communication should be an essential service in the library. "Rap" is the nonce word, and it means rapport, not "knock"! Was it in New York that a priest obtained permission to work as a bartender because he found that people communicate to a bartender more freely than to a priest?

Communicate. Relate. Give one-stop service. There are practical limits, perhaps, where intensive specialization is needed. Unless every staff member is trained to know about everything, sooner or later the user will have to be handed on from one person to another. The general medical practitioner doesn't hesitate to call in the specialist. This does not invalidate the idea of sympathetic one-stop service, if both staff members relate effectively to the user.

Scrap all our public services, if need be, and redesign from scratch.

It is easy to give such advice. It is easy to be an iconoclast. All you need is ignorance and a hammer. Unfortunately, that is not enough when you must stay around afterward to pick up the pieces. Recommendations for substitute idols, or at least substitute patterns, are therefore in order. As I said at the beginning, I'm not sure I can offer solutions this afternoon.

I doubt that there will be much sudden demand for hammers at the hardware store tomorrow, as Canadian librarians commence demolishing their patterns of service and rebuilding at my urging. Canadians are seldom eager espousers of theoretical causes, if old ways have long worked---however creakily. The thing for which Canadians are most noted is appointing commissions and ignoring their reports. Canadian librarians are model citizens in this respect.

You will say that our public services are designed to serve our library users with library materials most easily. But is there something wrong with our physical system of arranging materials, with different forms of material separated? Is

this for the convenience of the custodian, and not the user?

Our main library has seven public service points. Don't ask me why it was built that way---ask the architect---who has recently completed another mausoleum in Toronto. We have hopes, with fifty thousand dollars in renovations, to do away with at least two or three public service desks. The reason for all these? Each physical form of material has been isolated and served by a separate unit. One unit head said, "This building has split things up so badly that users, particularly in Canadian studies, can get totally frustrated trooping from one reference desk to another to another. In Archives, Documents, Special Collections, different forms of material require different acquisitions procedures, different methods of processing, and different finding tools---but from a researcher's point of view they are one. Therefore we should work, by physical and administrative changes, toward having one reference point and one reference room where all these materials may be consulted, and reference staff, subject specialists, who can provide 'integrated' service, possibly running it as a separate division."

There is a further point in planning for integrated collection management. Integrate management first. Integrate, paradoxical as it may sound, by diversifying. Place the responsibility on a group---with a responsible individual to be referee, but give the group the responsibility. The group must not be too large---half a dozen is about right. Let them see problems as system-related, not as unique and separate; and let them bring a totality of viewpoints to bear on solutions. When they become familiar enough with each other to develop mutual trust, and learn not to waste time objecting to each other's ideas but to think of better ones, they'll become effective management groups. It takes time. As Ralph Stierwalt said in describing such a participative management structure at the University of Western Ontario, "For awhile this was the meetingest place in the world."

That was at a Toronto workshop held by the Institute of Professional Librarians of Ontario, on library administrative structures and management patterns. In the Library Journal report are the following sentences:

> ...opening up communication on both the lateral and vertical levels and providing initiatives at all levels of decision making, possibly by delegating responsibility to progressively smaller units. The team approach at North York Public Library---where every employee has the status of a manager and where decentralization is a key concept---was strongly supported.*

* Lib.J.98 no.8 p.1236 (April 15,1973

David Sellers has in the February Special Libraries a six-page article which I commend to you. It is titled "Basic Planning and Budgeting Concepts for Special Libraries" but it is as concise and meaty a statement of library management as I have read. Permit me to read the abstract and a couple of sentences of text:

> Many administrators in special libraries have no formal training in the techniques of strategic management but are discovering that these techniques must be used to solve their current fiscal problems. Of primary importance in planning is a clear statement of a library's mission, from which can be drawn guiding principles and continuous objectives. Only the consistent participation of all personnel in the planning process, however, will make planning effective. Once a plan is set up and operating, budget can reflect goals as well as expenditures.
>
> ... If the administration has not told people where the library is going, and hopefully allowed them to take part in this decision-making process, then the administration should not be surprised if the people have done some thinking for themselves as to the library's future. ... It is important to allow

> lead time so that people can tie their personal objectives in some reasonable way to the objectives set for the library. Hopefully, by a feedback process, they may be able to provide input to adjust the library objectives and to adjust their own goals to those formulated by the organization.*

* Spec. Libs. 64-no. 2 p.70, 71 (Feb.1973)

One of our staff felt our first session on this workshop topic had been negative---that it had said not enough was being done in public relations and student orientation. He said, "The use of our department has increased phenomenally since I started here. We discussed the question of whether or not the threshold of diminishing returns has been approached in our outreach efforts. Even if this were not the case, there are only so many hours possibly available for this activity---and the way things are set up, and the extent of the workload, have exhausted the time resources." The emphasis is mine.

He's right, of course. But the answer is contained in what he said. Each unit has been working away by itself. Our physical setup has been less than good, and our staff have been exhausting themselves---needlessly. The next step must be to build on the groundwork of goodwill which this and other staff members have built up among users, and to develop integrated services. He went on:

"Hardly a week passes that nearly all... don't use our resources, be they in sciences, engineering, health sciences, arts, or social sciences. Use is also made of our unit by businessmen, professional people, government offices, high school students, university administrators, and community groups. ... This has not interfered with our primary service to the university community." There is the spectrum of users, and the ability to cope with diverse needs.

Library Journal for March 1 describing the "background briefing" for the National Commission on Libraries and Information Services* reported Eli Oboler as saying that libraries,

* Lib.J. 98 no.5 p.683 (March 1, 1973)

caught up in a cloud-cuckoolaand of the future, have almost ignored the exigencies of the present. He urged the Commission to concentrate on the libraries and the problems of today, instead of zeroing in on the mechanical and technological potentialities of libraries. Cooperative measures which did not require ultramechanization were just as important as gadgets. The will for cooperation was the most important single factor which needed the Commission's encouragement.

Oboler went on to urge a national library network, and federal subsidies for support resource centers. Cecily J. Surace criticized the objectives of cooperative library systems, saying that most systems tend to provide a stepped-up version of existing services at a greater cost, when a different kind of library effort might be needed. It would be more useful and efficient for libraries being pressured to follow the "local needs" approach, to attempt instead to provide guidelines and objectives to further intertype library development. The first sentence is more important for my point than the second.

I have not in this rambling discussion mentioned hardware. Hardware is useful but it is not the essential great-long-sought answer to all our problems. Many of our problems lie in our own adherence to patterns of past days and simplistic staffing.

J. L. Carmon in Special Libraries for February talks about "A Campus-Based Information Center".* That title reveals what this business should be all about. He says:

> Many users indicated that the computer-based services have brought them back into the library and made them aware of many sources of information which were previously unknown to them. And the subsequent ease of use of the library was stressed sufficiently often to postulate that it was the reference materials,

including such resources as the indexes and abstracting journals (and perhaps the card catalogs) which were the bottleneck in efficient and easy use of the library materials.

* Spec. Libs. 64 no.2 p.68 (Feb.1973)

Computerized systems bump manual systems, not necessarily because computerized systems are better, but sometimes because the manual systems have so many intricacies in use that users become impatient. There are other reasons as well, but let's not forget this one. Joan Maier in the same issue of Special Libraries, in another paper presented this week at SLA, discussed "The Scientist Versus Machine Search Services: We Are the Missing Link":

> The scientist needs continuous personal assistance by a librarian or information specialist in order to make effective use of data bases... As local retailer, the librarian has an accordingly important role to play now and in the future, a role at present generally ignored.*

* Spec.Libs. 64 no.2 p.111 (Feb.1973)

There is the marketing analogy again.

To sum up:

Look at what we are doing now. Scrap it if necessary.

Integrate resources, integrate services. Use marketing research if necessary, to plan how to sell our services.

Cooperate. Budget.

But first and foremost, decide on objectives and priorities.

Look at management practices and structures. This is basic to everything.

See if it doesn't make a difference.

Quoting Ramirez again: "Wasserman reminds us that society's primary demand is that library leaders and practitioners actively redirect their attention and concerns from library buildings and collections to a more proper interest in the informational needs of people. Along with the author, I feel that this is long overdue, and we must act

> if we are to keep pace with a changing society and a changing complex of informational and educational needs. I, for one, would deplore a place on the shelf between a dinosaur and a passenger pigeon."*

* Lib.J.98 no. 8 p.1259 (April 15, 1973)

The university's role in its community is as an active information resource, with active services from a concerned staff. Information doesn't come pre-packaged any more--- if it ever did. Don't let the library become a supermarket, and your circulation desk simply a checkout counter, where no one knows the value of anything and all the customers grumble at the soaring figures on the cash register. So what if your circulation is increasing? People will go where they can get information most easily, and do without it if they can't get it easily. Take lessons from Information Kingston and from the bartender priest. Don't worry about "outside" users. We may not be serving our primary users well enough. When we succeed in doing so, we can probably take the secondary users in stride.